REC'D OCT 27 1961

DEMOCRATIC
GERMAN REPORT

Vol. X No. 19 | September 29th 1961 | Price: 15 Pf, 5c, 3d.

World TU Appeal

Trade Union leaders from all parts of the world issued on appeal for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany as the first step to world disarmament at the conclusion of an emergency meeting in East Berlin from September 22nd to 24th.

The meeting had been called on the initiative of the World Federation of Trade Unions, but many of the delegates came from union bodies not affiliated to the Federation, such as the huge Japanese Sohyo union. Altogether 114 million trade unionists were represented. They issued two appeals, one addressed to the workers of all countries, and the other to the workers and unionists of West Germany.

The appeal to the workers of the world stated:

"The immediate conclusion of a German Peace Treaty is a central factor in the fight for peace. It would open the path to general disarmament and peaceful co-existence. Your action to reach this goal is an important part of the struggle which you pursue against all imperialist aggression.

"The western governments have so far ignored all sensible proposals made on this subject, and have pushed ahead with war preparations. The time has come for the international working class to take the matter in hand and develop a powerful mass action."

The appeal to the workers of West Germany pointed out that they had a historic responsibility to prevent a repetition of the crimes of the nazi period, and continued:

"Fight for the implementation of the resolutions passed by your own trade union congress against rearmament and war. Struggle for the preservation of trade union rights, and an end to the persecution of all those in West Germany who stand up for peace and disarmament.

"Join with us in the common fight for the conclusion of the German peace treaty and the solution of the West Berlin problem by negotiation."

A BORROWED EDITORIAL

We intended to write an editorial on the so-called Berlin crisis this week, but we have been saved the trouble. The mass-circulation Canadian magazine "Maclean's" made such a good job of it in its issue of August 26th that we reprint it, slightly shortened, below, only noting the factual error that West Berlin is not "part of NATO":

Canadians don't normally think of themselves as subject to propaganda. That happens to the Russians and the Chinese, the Arabs under Nasser or the Germans under Hitler, not to citizens of a democracy served by a free press. Yet the fact is that we are, right now, targets of a propaganda campaign for which it's hard to find a precedent in peacetime. Its object is to make us believe in a crisis over Berlin.

For weeks the reports of U.S. news services have been alerting us to the imminence of a showdown. The western powers are said to be warning Khrushchov to "keep hands off West Berlin". In the face of "threats" by Khrushchov the West is "standing firm", set to "defend" West Berlin with nuclear weapons if need be.

And what exactly is it that Khrushchov is threatening to do in Berlin?

He is threatening to go away. That is the menace that has dismayed the Germans and confused the whole western alliance – not a Soviet attack but a Soviet withdrawal. In the tug of war across the border of divided Germany, Khrushchov is trying the tactic of letting go the rope. The other team, he hopes, will then fall flat on its back ...

Germany's national honor is no concern of ours, and German unification is only a minor one ...

We are pledged to fight if West Berlin is attacked – all the NATO partners are sworn to treat an attack upon one as an attack on all, and West Berlin is a part of that alliance. But we are not pledged to fight for any other interest of German foreign policy, and specifically not to protect West Germany from the necessity of taking some unpalatable steps.

Some such steps are inevitable. It has been obvious for years that as soon as Khrushchov felt that he could trust the East German Communist puppets to maintain their hold on the country, he would draw back and leave the West no alternative but to recognise them. He has now been proclaiming, for about three years, his intention of doing so immediately. At last, apparently, he means it. There is nothing the West can do to prevent this. It's not what we want, but it's what we've got. To call it a pretext for nuclear war is madness.

THE PATH AHEAD

By Walter Ulbricht

(In a television fire-side chat on September 15th Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR, spoke about the tasks ahead. On this page we publish some of main points which he made.)

What lies ahead of us? The main task in the coming months is the conclusion of a German peace treaty. Linked with this problem is the establishment of the full sovereignty of the GDR, a sovereignty which must and will be respected by all other states; and our full control over all our transit routes of communication, a control which is exercised by every sovereign state. *(Mr Ulbricht is here referring especially to the transit routes between West Germany and West Berlin which pass through the GDR, ed.)* Our opponents say that our unconditional claim to control our transit routes means that we wish to erect obstacles. This is obviously hostile nonsense. Control does not mean disturbance, but order: this means that we wish to establish order on the transit routes in accordance with normal practices in international law.

The Governments of the western powers have named three questions which they hold must be settled in the manner they desire. They state that any agreement on West Berlin must make provision for:

1. The presence of the troops of the western powers in West Berlin.
2. The maintenance of West Berlin's viability.
3. The maintenance of transit routes between West Berlin and West Germany.

On point 1 I can only say that we believe that there is no legal basis for the presence of occupation troops in West Berlin, and that this presence is superfluous; but this is a question which the western powers should discuss with the Soviet Government. They should agree on the modus for liquidating occupation rights in West Berlin, which are simply a left-over from the Second World War.

On point 2, the viability of West Berlin, it should be clear to everybody that the part-city of West Berlin, lying in the middle of the German Democratic Republic, can never become viable if it does not abandon its role of cold war centre and establish normal peaceful relations with the GDR. That is to say that West Berlin must become a demilitarised Free City. Neither the Americans, nor the British, nor the West Germans can guarantee West Berlin's viability if it does not become a demilitarised Free City in whose internal affairs nobody should interfere.

On point 3, the maintenance of transit routes, it is a matter of public knowledge that these transit routes all pass through the sovereign territory of the GDR. We have repeatedly declared that we are ready to conclude agreements with all states interested in transit traffic with West Berlin, and that when West Berlin is converted into a demilitarised neutral Free City we are ready to guarantee these transit routes. When the governments of the western powers are ready to face facts it should not be difficult to reach an understanding.

The German Democratic Republic has consistently called for an understanding to be reached (on broader problems, ed.). On what subjects can an understanding be reached? We believe that an understanding is possible on a German Peace Treaty. If the western powers today do not wish to sign this treaty, then they will soon be faced with the necessity of recognising this peace treaty, and will have to participate in sweeping away all the remnants of the Second World War. It would seem to be useful for the western powers too to act in time.

When we turn to the question of the two German states, we see that the question would not be so difficult if these two states would simply conclude a pledge of mutual non-intervention. This would mean that West Germany would have to abandon every idea of a war of revenge and the conquest of the GDR. This would open the path for an understanding which could lead gradually to cooperation between the two German staes in the framework of a confederation, and finally to the ending of the division of Germany.

GDR Municipal Elections

New district councils and town councils were elected in the German Democratic Republic on September 17th. Nearly 99% of all electors went to the polls to give their approval to the coalition list of candidates presented by the National Front, the organisation formed by the parties, trade unions and other bodies in the GDR. The actual task of selecting the candidates for the combined list was carried out in the weeks preceding the election at thousands of factory and street meetings, at which the retiring members of the district and town councils gave an accounting of their work in the past four years, and new candidates were selected.

W. German Poll – Mixture as Before

The West German parliamentary elections on September 17th resulted in Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democrats losing the clear majority which they had enjoyed in the old parliament. In the new parliament the Christian Democrats have 250 seats (277 in 1957); the Social Democrats have 203 seats (181), and the Free Democrats have 66 seats (43).

GERMAN REPORT comments: Although there has been a considerable swing away from Adenauer's Christian Democrats, there is not expected to be any noticeable change in West German policies, since all three parties represented in parliament have the same programme of support for NATO, nuclear weapons for the West German Wehrmacht, conquest of the German Democratic Republic, and revision of Germany's eastern frontiers. The 1961 parliament, just as all previous West German parliaments, will be dominated by former nazis, professional officers, and "hard-faced businessmen who did well out of the war".

Electoral analysts pointed out however that there were signs that West German electors were becoming dissatisfied with Adenauer's policies. Both the Social Democrats and the Free Democrats won nearly two million votes more than in the previous election, and a large proportion of these votes came from electors who were searching for an alternative to Adenauer's war policy. They had given their support to the Social Democrats or the Free Democrats, regarding them as the lesser evil.

The German Peace Union, the only real opposition party, which ran on a programme of nuclear disarmament and neutralisation for Germany, received about two percent of the total poll, despite a ferocious campaign of slander and electoral hindrance directed against it. If the parliament had been selected by full proportional representation, the vote given to the German Peace Union would have given this party about ten seats in parliament.

In a coming issue GERMAN REPORT will present a more thorough analysis of the composition of the new West German parliament, and the new cabinet which will be appointed in October.

Cold War on Anglers

The West German Government forbade West German anglers to attend the World Anglers Championships held in the German Democratic Republic late in September. Most other European countries, including Britain, France, Belgium and Switzerland sent teams.

All About the "Air Corridors"

In the past few weeks, an ever recurring headline in Western papers has been "New Red Threat to Berlin Air Corridors". What are these air corridors, how do they function, and what is the argument all about?

The history of the establishment of the air corridors between West Berlin and West Germany is fairly clear. When British, French and American occupation forces moved into Berlin in July 1945, two months after the end of the war, to join the Soviet occupation forces who had taken the city, a number of rather vaguely worded agreements were concluded by the Four-Power Allied Control Council governing lines of communication between West Germany and West Berlin. Western forces and occupation agencies were given the right to move supplies and personnel along various roads and railways across the hundred-mile strip of Soviet-occupied territory between West Germany and West Berlin, and three air corridors, twenty miles broad, were provided. At the time that these agreements were concluded, the four occupation powers wielded full and undisputed control of the administration of all parts of Germany, and the question of anybody except allied occupation personnel using the air corridors was not even discussed. Starting in 1947, various American, British and French civil air-lines began to use the air corridors, and today the bulk of traffic in the corridors consists of civilian planes carrying businessmen and tourists from and to Berlin.

The "eastern" point of view on the air corridors has been laid down clearly in an exchange of notes between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Governments of the western allies over the past few weeks. On August 24th 1961, the Soviet Union addressed a protest note to the three western powers stating in part:

"All kinds of revanchists, extremists, saboteurs and spies are being transferred from the German Federal Republic to West Berlin. The western powers use the air corridors to transfer them. In this way the United States, Britain and France are plainly abusing their position in West Berlin, taking advantage of the absence of supervision over air communications. This represents a flagrant breach of the agreement reached in 1945 under which air corridors were set aside for the three western powers, on a temporary basis, to meet the needs of their military garrisons, and not for the subversive and revanchist purposes of West German militarism."

Bonn Planes Invade GDR

On September 14th two West German war planes flew, without permission, across more than 100 miles of the territory of the German Democratic Republic, and landed at the French airfield in West Berlin. The West German authorities claimed that the planes had "lost their way".

Authoritative sources in East Berlin stated that there were grounds for believing that the West German planes, fighter-bombers of the type F 84, had been ordered to make the flight in order to provoke an incident, and to sabotage all attempts to reach a sensible East-West agreement on the air corridors between West Germany and West Berlin.

In a strongly worded protest note to the West German Government on September 18th, the Soviet Union gave a warning that in future military planes which infringed the airspace of the German Democratic Republic would be ordered to land, and shot down if they failed to comply. The Foreign Ministry of the GDR also protested strongly against the flight, and requested the French authorities in West Berlin, who are holding the West German pilots, to hand them over to the GDR so that the necessary investigations could be made.

The Soviet note then quoted examples of the arrival of official representatives of the West German Government in West Berlin along the air corridors, and continued: "Their coming was accompanied by the organisation of rallies and demonstrations at which slogans calling for aggression against peace-loving neighbouring states were openly proclaimed." The Soviet note called upon the western allies to stop this misuse of the air corridors, and to "put an end to the unlawful and provocative activities of the German Federal Republic in West Berlin."

In a further note on September 3rd, the Soviet Government pointed out that the Four-Power agreements on the air corridors had been concluded before the establishment of two sovereign German states, during the period of the occupation of Germany. This occupation had in the meantime been terminated by means of appropriate statements made by the occupying powers. The Soviet Note continued:

"The Soviet Government has repeatedly declared that it does not intend to restrict in any way the international links of West Berlin in general, and with the German Federal Republic in particular. After the conclusion of a peace treaty, West Berlin as a free city would have the right to maintain diplomatic, economic and cultural links with any country of any continent: but it cannot be a centre of subversion against the German Democratic Republic, on the territory of which it is located. The Free City of West Berlin will naturally have the right of unhindered communications with the external world, but this right would not arise from the occupation, but from appropriate agreements with the governments of those countries across whose territories its communications would run."

The last sentence of this Soviet Note gets to the core of the matter. After the conclusion of the peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, which will be signed before the end of 1961, the various rights and usages arising from the original occupation status of West Berlin will become void, and airlines wishing to fly across the territory of the German Democratic Republic will have to conclude the usual agreements with the GDR Government. GDR spokesmen have repeatedly pointed out that it is normal international usage for air-lines to conclude such agreements with all countries which they overfly. GDR Deputy Foreign Minister Otto Winzer stated on August 29th: "The GDR is willing to conclude such agreements with all countries on a basis of equality and mutual advantage".

The western point of view, put at great length in notes addressed to the Soviet Government and published on August 28th and September 8th, may be summarised as "what we have we hold". The notes emphasise that the air corridors were established by quadripartite agreement in 1945, but completely ignore the Soviet

point that these quadripartite agreements have been long outmoded a) by western breach of the Potsdam Agreement upon which the whole of the four-power administration of Germany was based, and b) by the subsequent establishment of two distinct sovereign German states.

The western note of September 8th states: "As of today there is free and peaceful movement of persons and goods by air between West Germany and West Berlin. Any change in this situation will be the result of aggressive action against established rights by the Soviet Government and the East German regime."

This is simply standing facts on their head. If Aeroflot, the civil airline of the Soviet Union, wished to run a polar flight route to Cuba crossing the territory of the United States, it would conclude a normal international agreement with the United States on the subject. If Pan-American Airways wish to fly planes across the German Democratic Republic to West Berlin, it will have to conclude a normal international agreement with the German Democratic Republic.

Junior Pin-up

The cover photo of "GDR Review" also shows new buildings in East Berlin, and articles in the brightly-illustrated monthly magazine tell about new housing construction, sports, dance groups and the GDR's biggest inland port. For your free sample copy and details on how to subscribe, write to:

GDR Review
Verlag Zeit im Bild
Spenerstrasse 21
Dresden A 19
German Democratic Republic

"Wehrmacht Tops Hitler's" — *French Paper*

The West German Army is already stronger than the army with which Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia in 1938, the progressive Paris weekly "L'Express" stated on September 14th, in a study of West German militarism. Here are some of the main points from the article:

"The West German journalist Rudolf Augstein recently made the apparently surprising statement that the new West German army had not been established to defend the Bonn state, but that on the contrary this curious rump state had been established so that a German army for use against the Soviet Union could be formed.

"This statement appears surprising at first glance, since the new German military power is not so obvious... Hitlerite Germany liked to boast of its military power; but the present policy is to play it down.

"For years, for instance, it was stated Adenauer's Germany did not want to have an arms industry of its own. The Germans, we were told, had realised that the production and export of consumer goods was much more profitable than making arms. In actual fact, however, there has been a steady rise in the German production of military equipment since 1953. At present between 60% and 70% of the arms supplied to the Wehrmacht are of German production.

"This production has been described by the Arms Commission of Industrial Assocation in harmless terms as 'improvement in quality'. First of all the German firms 'improved' the raw materials supplied by the allies and such firms as Hispano-Suiza and Oerlikon; and then they proceeded to produce themselves 'high-quality' machine-guns, jet-planes, and rockets, always explaining loudly at the same time that they did not really like to do this work.

"Today the Bonn Government has no need to descend to subterfuges in order to obtain conventional weapons. Apart from American, British and French supplies it can call upon the products of its own arsenals, which are run by the 'Industrial Administration Company'.

"This company, which is solely answerable to the Bonn Defence Ministry, and which is kept hidden from alien eyes, and even from Bonn M.P.s, devotes itself mainly to 'research on industrial production materials', although its official role is to administer old Wehrmacht stocks. There is every reason to believe that it is working in the deepest secrecy on preparations for the next and decisive stage of re-armament — the manufacture of the atomic, bacteriological and chemical weapons which the Federal Republic is not yet entitled to manufacture under international treaty.

"Military pressure has become the quintessence of West German policy today, because a small circle of powerful people in Bonn have come to the conclusion that German military potential makes it possible for them to pursue a 'policy of strength'. These circles are convinced that the new Wehrmacht, which is underrated in the world at large, represents a secret trump in their hands, a trump which will enable the Federal Republic to claim the role of 'bastion against Bolshevism'."

GDR Defence Law

The People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic passed a new Defence Law on September 20th. The new law gives the State Council the right to declare a "state of defence" if the GDR should be attacked, if there is danger of such attack, or in fulfillment of international obligations. During the "state of defence" the State Council would be entitled to take all measures necessary for defending the GDR.

Introducing the law to the People's Chamber, Defence Minister Heinz Hoffmann, former officer of the International Brigades in Spain, pointed out that the GDR was reluctantly taking measures for defence following the failure of the West German Government to respond to all proposals for negotiations. He recalled that the GDR had made more than 100 proposals for East-West discussions which would have brought to an end the dangerous military developments in West Germany, such as the equipment of the West German Wehrmacht with atomic weapons. In addition the GDR had in the past taken unilateral measures such as the reduction of its armed forces.

Defence Minister Hoffmann stressed that the GDR was ready for negotiations today as it had been in the past, but that as long as West German authorities rejected all offers and went ahead with their plans for attacking the GDR, it was necessary for Democratic Germany to take the military steps needed to ensure peace.

Mr JEKYLL & Dr HEYDE

By Allen Mann

What would you do if you discovered a brutal, unrepentant murderer in your town? The modern "Jekyll and Hyde" mystery which has been spoiling West Germany's primly democratic make-up in past months centred around just this key question: what do *you* do if you know that prosperous, good-natured Jekyll, a leading light of the town, is really the murderous Hyde?

Twenty leading public figures in the West German province of Schleswig-Holstein supplied one answer. They did absolutely nothing. For years professors, public prosecutors and top judges knew the truth about the German Mr Hyde, but watched his prestige and his income grow; some of them kept their mouths shut: others aided and abetted him.

The odd angle to the story is that his name really is almost the same as that of Robert Louis Stevenson's monster: Dr Werner Heyde, alias Dr Sawade.

•

Back in 1939, Heyde was a psychiatrist who helped Hitler in his so-called euthanasia or "mercy-killing" programme. This programme was aimed at getting rid of people deemed useless; at first, people with mental ailments or mis-shapen and imbecile children. Such people were gassed in five special stations, and Dr Heyde was responsible for certifying medically that these people were not fit to be kept alive.

This "mercy-killing" was done without consulting the relatives of the victims. They received only letters regretting "Unsuccessful appendix operations" or other sudden illnesses and inquiring whether they would like to have the ashes of the deceased. There is evidence that Dr Heyde o. k.'d the killing of 300 patients from a single institution in the course of only three days, basing his rapid-fire decisions on questionnaires filled out by the head of the institution. Between November 14th and December 1st 1940, 2209 such questionnaires were sent on to him for certification.

This is a quotation from the questionnaire which was sent out to all mental institutions:

"All patients must be reported who

1. suffer from the following diseases... schizophrenia, epilepsy, senile illnesses, weak-mindedness ...

2. have been at least five years in institutions

3. are held as criminally insane, or

4. do not have German citizenship or are not of German or related blood; race and nationality should be listed."

A footnote gives examples of how to answer the question on race: "German blood, Jewish, Jewish half-breed 1st or 2nd degree, Negro (half-breed), Gypsy (half-breed), etc."

The number of people gassed under this programme surpassed 70,000, it is estimated, and soon even the complaisant Hitler-time public began to get suspicious and worried. A newspaper in one city published three almost identical notices of sudden deaths in its columns one day, all from the same mental institution. Someone's daughter died suddenly of appendicitis; her appendix had been removed ten years earlier. Another person received two different urns, each allegedly containing the mortal remains of the same relative. Even children in villages situated near the death houses knew what the smoke came from; when curtained busses filled with victims drove by, they said, "There goes another load to be gassed" or "I think you're crazy. Watch out or you'll land in the ovens."

Several bishops complained, and military leaders feared that this liquidation of German citizens was harming the war effort.

At this point, in the summer of 1941, the euthanasia programme was moved to the concentration camps, where there were never any complaints. Hundreds of camp inmates, imprisoned for political reasons or because they were Jewish or Gypsy, were certified "incurably insane" at drum-head investigations. This method of getting rid of prisoners became known in the concentration camps as "Operation Heyde". Here is how it worked:

"The Commission consisted of 4 psychiatrists, led by Dr Heyde ... I saw how these 4 doctors sat at 4 separate tables between two barracks, and how many hundreds of prisoners lined up in front of them. The individual prisoners were examined in respect to their ability to work and their political record and sorted out respectively. I know that this commission was only in Dachau a few days and could not possibly medically examine so many prisoners in that short time. The examination consisted only in looking at the record in the presence of the prisoner. The prisoners involved were Germans, men of other nationalities, Jews, etc. I can say positively that Professor Heyder led this action ... A few weeks after this commission left Dachau concentration camp, in December 1941, the first transport of several hundred inmates who had been examined by the commission of psychiatrists, was sent to Mauthausen concentration camp to be gassed."

(Document NO-2799, Case II [Milch Case], Nuremberg War Trials)

This method of getting rid of concentration camp inmates was soon developed on a mass scale — for Auschwitz, Treblinka and Maidanek, where many millions were murdered — often with the expert help of technicians trained in the euthanasia programme of Dr Heyde and his associates.

•

So much for Dr Heyde's nazi past. When the war ended he was caught and interned. Just before he was put on trial in 1947, he escaped from an American truck carrying prisoners — and disappeared. Here is the record of what happened since then — or all that was revealed by a West German official investigating commission, which certainly hushed up some of the details.

After disappearing, Heyde found a job with friends as a gardener and caretaker in the northern province of Schleswig-Holstein in West Germany — a notorious gathering place for submerged nazis.

In mid-1950 he sent his wife as a patient to Hans Glatzel, a doctor active in the law courts of Flensburg, to sound him out on his ideas and politics. She brought good tidings, and he went back to the doctor with her — under his newly-adopted name of Dr Fritz Sawade. The meeting was a complete success. Heyde told the doctor his real name and about his past, and Dr Glatzel, who should have turned him in, took him instead to the director of the state insurance administration, a Dr Buresch, and suggested that "Sawade" be employed as medical authority and medical investigator. Dr Buresch agreed: "If he is professionally qualified — I'm not interested in anything else!"

This was the beginning of Heyde-Sawade's march to prosperity. He took on more and more cases as medical adviser for the state insurance administration, for the Schleswig-Holstein State Court for Social Welfare Disputes and for many other courts. He earned a total of 300,000 marks, it is estimated. In addition Frau Heyde, who lived in Munich, filed claims for a widow's pension. Since widows of nazi officials have always been especially favoured in West Germany, she was able to collect 65,000 marks between 1952 and 1959.

In 1954, Dr Sawade's incognito was suddenly endangered. Professor Creutzfeldt, a retired psychiatrist, recognised him and wrote a long letter to Judge Buresch, now a court president, telling him the truth about Heyde, the prosperous court medical adviser. Judge Buresch, very excited, went to the public prosecutor in Flensburg, a man named Bruno Bourwieg, showed him the letter, and asked what should be done. Public Prosecutor Bourwieg thought it over carefully and then advised him to do absolutely nothing. On his advice, Buresch returned the letter to Professor Creutzfeldt, who also decided to take no further action.

It is important to recall that Heyde's name was on the "Wanted" list of the West German police records, with a big black triangle meaning murderer next to it. His crimes had also been published in full in a book sent to all West German doctors. Nobody can claim ignorance of the extent of his crimes, or what concealing his whereabouts implied.

More and more people found out about Heyde-Sawade. Judge Schlüter, who often presided at cases where Sawade was a witness, knew the secret, saw Heyde perjure himself by taking his court oath under a false name, and said nothing.

Judge Michaelis, president of the legal senate, kept quiet. Professor Hallermann, a famous psychiatrist, kept quiet. Ministerial Councillor Heigl, head of the local health administration, did the same. The total list of people known to have kept quiet includes 7 university professors, 4 senate presidents, 3 welfare judges, one federal judge, 3 doctors and several legal and government councillors — a total of at least 22 in all.

Why did they keep quiet? The newspapers of West Germany have written long articles about this, based on the explanatory attempts of the investigating commission. They have listed the following reasons: they wanted to help make good a scarcity of court advisers; they wanted to help a colleague; they did not like "squealing"; they did not consider themselves qualified to take any steps in the matter; they believed that if Heyde worked for top courts in a leading position for so long, he must be alright; they felt that if the official prosecutor did not do anything about him, they had no reason to stick their own necks out. All these reasons were summed up by the investigating commission as "a lack of political consciousness".

But the facts indicate a more cogent reason: these leaders of a North German community did not consider Heyde a criminal at all. They were not opposed to either his opinions or his actions during the nazi period. Indeed, in the West German atmosphere of today, the nazi crimes of years ago were merely mistakes, or even glorious deeds.

The men who kept quiet about Heyde were, often enough, old friends and accomplices, now in high places. Dr Hallermann, for example, one of those who remained silent, had gone to college with Heyde back in 1925. Judge Schlüter, who watched from the judge's bench while Heyde perjured himself, had shared a room with him in a British internment camp in 1945.

The conspiracy of silence flourished in the nationalist atmosphere in West Germany, and might have lasted forever, except that one professor let the story slip out in discussions with the police. His words made it official, and this meant that something had to be done. A search warrant was issued and a time set for picking up Dr Heyde — but when the police came, he was already long gone — disappeared in a southerly direction. The story got into the press and it became more and more difficult for Heyde to get away again. Finally, a week later, he turned himself in, in Frankfurt on November 11th 1959, and was put behind bars, where he is still awaiting trial.

The following scandal resulted in the investigating committee which has finally issued its report. At the same time, it admits that not all the people who knew of Heyde's real record were listed. "We shall never know them all," it stated.

Several questions remain to be answered therefore:

Who else knew about Heyde? How many top people were covered up by the investigators?

Who tipped off Heyde that he was to be arrested?

Did Heyde get help in his escape and his concealment from the police in November 1959?

How many other Heyde-Sawade cases are there in West Germany? Many war criminals are quite openly in leading positions. How many more are concealed or camouflaged, protected and supported by men who see no crime in nazi mass murder?

Better Late Than Never

The West German authorities have at last begun reluctantly to take action against former SS General Heinz Reinefarth, today mayor of Sylt and M. P. in the Schleswig-Holstein provincial parliament. During the Second World War Reinefarth commanded SS troops in the suppression of the Warsaw rising of 1944, and ordered the shooting of thousands of Polish civilians.

At the end of September 1961 the judicial authorities in Schleswig-Holstein finally took steps to deprive Reinefarth of his parliamentry immunity, so that legal proceedings can be opened against him. They claimed that this action was being taken now because "new evidence on Reinefarth's past has just been discovered in nazi files". This "new evidence", consisting of nazi documents naming Reinefarth as commander of the special SS murder squads in Warsaw has, in fact, been a matter of public record for at least four years. GERMAN REPORT published the full text of one of the documents now cited by the West German legal authorities on October 11th 1957. It was a year later that General Reinefarth was allowed to stand as candidate in pronvincial elections and get himself elected to the provincial parliament.

Democratic
GERMAN REPORT

Subscription rates: 4 marks, 8/- sterling, $ 1.25 per annum or pro rata, postage paid.

Subscriptions may be paid at the following addresses:

Democratic Germany: At all post offices.

Britain: Collet's Subscription Dept: 45 Museum St. London W, C. 1

"The Times" Drops a Clanger

By the Editor

On September 1st, GERMAN REPORT published at some length details of the career of Dr Hasso von Etzdorf, newly-appointed West German Ambassador to Britain.

On September 15th "The Times" of London devoted nearly a full column to an article from its Bonn correspondent trying to pick holes in our account. This was a rather difficult undertaking, since the GERMAN REPORT article had been based entirely upon details of the past career of Dr von Etzdorf taken from official West German documents, nazi files, and a book by Sir Lewis Namier, noted British historian.

The artcile in "The Times" decribed the GERMAN REPORT attack upon Dr. von Etzdorf as "scurrillous" and "particularly vicious", and went on to claim that this paper had quoted "selectively and out of context".

After making this charge, the Bonn correspondent of "The Times" then proceeded himself to quote out of context in a way which can only be described as fraudulent.

Here are the facts. Many of the main details on the wast career of Dr von Etzdorf were first published in an official West German document, a White Paper published by a committee of the Bundestag, the West German Parliament, in May 1952. This is what "The Times" had to say, on September 15th about this committee and its report:

"The Bundestag committee ... acknowledged that, 'as far as he (von Etzdorf) was able, the aforesaid actively resisted the Nazis to the extent of his ability, and suffered as a result'."

In fact the Bundestag committee said nothing of the sort. Here is a translation of the relevant paragraph of the report of the Bundestag committee, published as official paper No. 3465 of 1952:

"The Committee first investigated the de-nazification proceedings with regard to Dr v. Etzdorf. Under Article 13 of the Liberation Law of March 5th 1946 it has to be proven that the person in question actively resisted the Nazis to the extent of his ability, and suffered as a result. The Spruchkammer (de-nazification court) ruled that v. Etzdorf suffered disadvantages from the fact that he was constantly under moral pressure, and particularly from the fact that he was excluded from the otherwise usual favours, awards and promotion. The concrete facts regarding such exclusion could not be clarified. It could only be ascertained that this phrase is based upon the statement of a former Foreign Ministry official friendly to v. Etzdorf (Legationsrat Steg), and that it was then constantly repeated in the files."

This complete quotation shows that the Bundestag committee of 1952, far from ruling that von Etzdorf suffered as the result of alleged resistance to the nazis, regarded the proceedings of the de-nazification court with a certain reserve.

Since "The Times" does not usually indulge in flagrant falsification of quotations, it is perhaps charitable to assume that in this case the Bonn correspondent was unwisely basing himself upon some "facts" prepared for him by Dr Adenauer's propagandists, and that he did not take the precaution of consulting the original documents.

For the record, it should be noted that the Bundestag comittee of 1952 did state, at a later point in the document already quoted, that Dr von Etzdorf had done resistance work, but even here the rather curious comment is added: "It is open to question from what political standpoint this resistance was undertaken". Sir Lewis Namier, British historian, answered this open question in his book "In the Nazi Era" published in London in 1952. After summarising Dr von Etzdorf's "resistance", which consisted in urging late in 1939 that the German militarists should be content with their gains in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, and should not risk them by spreading the war, Sir Lewish commented: "The 'good' Germans' visibly change into Hitler profiteers".

I would be reluctant to believe that a correspondent of "The Times" cannot read, so I can only assume that he read GERMAN REPORT very hastily before penning his counter-attack. Here is the evidence. "The Times" stated:

"The long article (in GERMAN REPORT) makes liberal use of carefully selected extracts from official documents and memoranda ... to support the contention that Dr von Etzdorf was ... by implication associated with the looting of art treasures and the recruiting of Russian Quislings – though the author admits here that there is no documentary proof."

This is what GERMAN REPORT actually stated:

"The scanty documents which have survived show that Hasso von Etzdorf was closely linked with the 'Kuenzberg Commando', a special unit of the nazi Foreign Ministry which looted art treasures and secret archives in German-occupied territory; and other documents show that he was active in intelligence work, and particularly in the recruiting of Russian Quislings for service in the nazi cause."

It remains for "The Times" correspondent to show how "scanty documents" and "other documents" add up to "no documents." The next time that the Bonn correspondent of "The Times" is in Berlin I shall be delighted to show him the documents in question.

In conclusion it may be worth noting that the "The Times" makes no attempt to dispute the disclosures made in GERMAN REPORT that the new West German Ambassador to London was a long-time member of the nazi party, and a Lieutenant Colonel in the SA, Hitler's Storm Troops.

Win a New Reader

Fill in the name and address of a friend, work-mate or acquaintance on the form below, and send it to

Democratic German Report
Friedrichstrasse 167/III
Berlin W 8, German Democratic Republic

We shall be pleased to mail sample copies of the paper to him or her

Name .....

Address .....

BERLIN NOTEBOOK

By John Peet

The little village of Toeging in Bavaria, West Germany, does seem to me to be a little behind the times: a West German newspaper recently published a number of photographs showing that streets in the village are still decorated with name plates "Adolf Hitler Strasse" and "Hermann Goering Strasse". Somebody ought to tell them. But perhaps the village fathers are just pfennig-pinchers who are convinced that such names will soon come back into fashion again, and don't want to go to the expense of taking the old streets signs down.

Take Your Choice

Which column of the august "Times" of London do you read? In a more than usually silly article on the German Democratic Republic published on the leader page on September 11th, I noted the following: in column one, the "Times" correspondent reported: "People do not dare to talk to one another in public. In trams and in cafes they speak in low tones or in whispers." In column two of the same article, same author, same page, he went on: "'Is it not dangerous for you to talk to me?' I asked a table companion in a café. 'Not very, because you are a foreigner, and most of the people here feel as I do', he replied."

You pick your column, and take your choice.

Over-Stuffed

While we are on the subject of "dangerous talk" in cafés, allow me to repeat a madly insane quotation from the American newsletter "Report to Management" dated September 2nd 1953:

"Symptoms of dictatorship are visible on every hand (in East Berlin, ed.). New gimmick showplace restaurant on Stalin Allee, Café Warschau, guarantees comfort but no privacy.

"Big tables with over-stuffed chairs permit no more than four people where eight could be seated. Reason for it is to assure that all conversations will be loud and public."

I first re-printed this lovely gem in 1953, but I feel sure it is worth disinterring.

Imagined Incidents

Mr Walter Lippmann, one of the most serious and worth-reading of American political commentators, has been writing good sense now for well over forty years: I recall that his balanced articles on the young Soviet Republic were favourably commented on by Lenin himself back in 1921.

Searching for something quite different in old newspaper files this week, I stumbled upon another sensible and very up-to-the minute quote from Mr Lippmann. Writing in the "New York Herald Tribune" on June 27th 1952, he stated:

"Hardly a day passes without an incident in Berlin, or in the corridors to Berlin. They ... consists of incidents which are provoked, imagined, fabricated, or have just happened by accident, in a border region which is in a condition of high tension and extreme alert. Until recently the extraordinary thing about Berlin has not been how many, but how few have been the incidents, considering the crazy way in which the unfriendly forces are scrambled."

Old Quote Week

This does appear to be rather a week for dredging up very old quotations, but I like one I have just bumped into. In spring 1947 the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four sat around in Moscow, discussing the perennial problem of what to do about Germany, and on April 7th Mr Ernest Bevin, then British Foreign Minister came up with a remarkably timely warning. He said: "I am not prepared to submit Britain's security to a people who had supported Adolf Hitler and who twice in one generation have waged aggressive wars. I agree to the formation of a Central German Government on condition that its powers be limited. I do not care whether that government is Communist, Socialist or Tory, so long as it is peaceful."

Remember?

And it is perhaps worthy of note that at that time the Americans were still strongly in favour of German demilitarisation. At the same conference on April 14th, the American Secretary of State George Marshall, proposed that the Foreign Ministers should immediately appoint plenipotentiaries to ensure German disarmament and demilitarisation for a 40 year period after the signing of a peace treaty with Germany.

If only the western allies had not changed their minds shortly afterwards, and re-armed West Germany, there would have been a peaceful, neutralised Germany in the centre of Europe today. I only hope that western statesmen, busy doing their homework for the negotiations on the German problem which must start soon, read and digest some of the admirable suggestions made by their predecessors.

Your Help, Please

Readers of GERMAN REPORT have often shown themselves ready in the past to help with all sorts of minor problems, particularly in the research field, so I should like to make a request. The US State Department, on March 30th 1945, just a month before the end of World War Two, issued a remarkably clear-sighted statement outlining the plans then being laid by German industrialists and militarists for a post-war comeback. The statement said in part:

"The German propangada programme is to be an integral part of the overal post war dirceted at removing Allied control measures by 'softening-up' the Allies through a subtle plea for 'fair treatment' of Germans, and later the programme will be expanded and intensified with the object of giving rebirth to nazi doctrines and furthering German ambitions for world domination."

The point upon which I want some help is this: the State Department statement says: "This Government is now in possession of photostatic copies of several volumes of German plans on this subject." I can find no trace in later American publications of any reference to these volumes of German plans. Have they ever been published? If not, where are these volumes now? If any reader could give me any help, I would be extremely grateful.

Just while I am on the subject, might I remind you that we are always extremely grateful to readers who can help us expand our reference library by contributing books on German questions. Particularly useful would be any of the various volumes on war crimes trials published in Britain and American soon after the war war, and the monthly and quarterly reports published by the British and American occupation authorities in West Germany between 1945 and 1950. White books and government papers on German questions would also be of value.

Edited and published fortnightly by John Peet. Democratic German Report, Friedrichstrasse 167/III, Berlin W 8, Telephone 22 29 68. Printed in the German Democratic Republic by (204). Veröffentlicht unter Lizenz-Nr. 694 des Presseamtes beim Vorsitzenden des Ministerrates der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik